



QUINCY PLANNING BOARD

Quincy City Hall, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, MA 02169
(617) 376-1362 FAX (617) 376-1097
TTY/TDD (617) 376-1375

PLANNING BOARD MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, June 19, 2013

MEMBERS PRESENT: Chairman William Geary, William Adams, Coleman Barry, James Fay

MEMBERS ABSENT: Richard Meade

OTHERS PRESENT: Dennis E. Harrington, Planning Director
Kristina Johnson, Planning, Transportation Director
Robert Stevens, Urban Renewal Planner
Christine Chaudhary, Planning Board Recording Secretary

Meeting called to order and attendance roll call taken at 7:02 PM by Chairman William Geary.

7:03 PM VOTE TO ACCEPT MAY 15, 2013, PLANNING BOARD MINUTES

MOTION: by Member Barry to accept the May 15, 2013, Planning Board meeting minutes

SECOND: Member Adams

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES

PUBLIC HEARING:

7:05 PM Public Hearing, 157 Hancock Street, Special Permit - Site Plan Review

Planning Board Case No. 2013-06

Chairman Geary read into the record: In accordance with the provisions of Chapter 40A, Section 11 MGL, and Title 17 of the Quincy Municipal Code, the Quincy Planning Board will hold a public hearing on **Wednesday, June 19, 2013 at 7:05 P.M.** in the new City Council Chambers, 2nd floor, Quincy City Hall Annex, 1305 Hancock Street, Quincy, Massachusetts, on the Application of Attorney William Keener, 1145 Hancock Street, Suite E, Quincy, MA 02169, for Site Plan Review under section 17.9.5.1(1) and special permit under 17.9.4 and 17.5.1.17 related to parking requirements. Landowner is Murphy Twin Development LLC, 21 Adley Drive, Abington, Massachusetts 02351. The 9,937 square foot lot is located at **157 Hancock Street**. The project is for the construction of 14 residential units in a 3.5 story building with associated parking and site improvements. The land is within a Business C zoning district and is shown on Assessors Map 6163, Plot 12.

7:07 PM: Planning Director Harrington informed the Planning Board and those in attendance that City Councillor Kevin Coughlin requested the Public Hearing be suspended until the Councillor's arrival at City Hall, which would be no later than 7:30 PM. Attorney William Keener agreed to wait for Councillor Coughlin. The Board did not disagree, and **Chairman Geary stated that the Public Hearing would be held until the Councillor's arrival. The Chairman went forward with Business Item #1 on the Agenda, re: Council Order 2013-077.**

BUSINESS MEETING:

Agenda Item #1: Presentation by peer review consultants and review of Planning staff comments regarding City Council SPGA, Council Order 2013-077, Zero Penn Street, Proposed construction in a PUD zoning district of a six-story, 180-unit residential building with 177-space structured parking garage on ground level, and 3 parking spaces elsewhere on site. Vote on Planning Board recommendation to Council.

Planning Director Harrington introduced Kristina Johnson, Planning, Transportation Director, as the staff member who was assigned to perform a technical review of this proposal. Ms. Johnson referenced her June 11, 2013, report letter to the Planning Board, which was also copied to the City Council acting as the Special Permit Granting Authority because, due to the site's PUD zoning. Ms. Johnson explained that the role of the Planning Board is to act in an advisory capacity to the City Council SPGA in this matter; the City Council conducts the full Public Hearing. She gave a brief overview of the proposal: Cabot, Cabot, & Forbes—the petitioner—has proposed to construct a six (6) story building consisting of 180 residential units with a structured parking garage containing 177 spaces located on a 100,067 square-foot parcel (2.29-acre) on the west side of Burgin Parkway, near the existing Lowe's Home Improvement Store.

Ms. Johnson gave a brief regulatory background for the parcel. She stated that in 2008 the parcel was included in the Massachusetts Environmental Policy Act (MEPA) filing for the Lowe's Home Improvement Store project, though it was permitted for 22,500 square feet of retail use, not residential use. Ms. Johnson stated that the City Council, at its last meeting, voted to continue the matter to sometime in September. The Council stated that the Application did not contain adequate information, especially related to architectural and traffic issues. Ms. Johnson stated that the Council felt they could not render an informed decision at the time based on the information submitted.

Ms. Johnson stated that the technical memo she provided to the Board (6/11/13) echoed peer review comments from Tighe & Bond and Holmes & Edwards; representatives from both firms were present. Ms. Johnson's review and the peer review comments were mainly related to stormwater management, architectural items, transit related issues, as well as comments similar to those expressed by the City Council at their last meeting. Shortly before this Planning Board meeting, Ms. Johnson received peer review response reports from: Cube3 (6/19/13 "draft"), responding to Holmes & Edwards peer review report (6/7/13); and, Tetra Tech (6/12/13), responding to Tighe & Bond (6/4/13).

Ms. Johnson introduced the City Council's peer review consultant from Tighe & Bond, Jennifer Viarengo, PE, who stated their review focused on the civil and transportation components of the proposed project. Ms. Viarengo stated that Jason Plourde, PE, PTP, Tighe & Bond transportation engineer, was also present. Ms. Viarengo stated that Tetra Tech's June 12, 2013, response report has, in general, addressed the majority of Tighe & Bond's peer review concerns. Ms. Viarengo stated that Tighe & Bond's comments included that the filing include and comply with a 2008 Order of Conditions, as well as other special conditions—dealing with the flood plain, brook protection, stormwater management, the transportation component, pedestrian distribution, etc. Ms. Viarengo stated that the outstanding issues include: assurance that the Fire Department approves the planned access and hydrants; confirmation that the DPW is satisfied with regard to its 2012 Conservation Commission comments; any items that the Applicant is committed to must be incorporated into their construction drawings.

Chairman Geary asked if the Board had any questions. None.

For the record, Ms. Kristina Johnson stated that copies of reports and comment letters were provided to the Board as attachments to her 6/11/13 memorandum to the Board. Ms. Johnson stated that the information that was provided to the City Council was not sufficient to gauge the size and magnitude of the proposed project. She introduced Mr. Diarmuid O'Connell, VP, Holmes & Edwards Architects, hired by City Council as the project peer review firm. Mr. O'Connell stated that the original submittal did not contain satisfactory information to perform a professional peer review. Holmes & Edwards was focused on substantiating the size of the building, the building's appearance, and how the building would be built. Mr. O'Connell stated that Holmes & Edwards worked closely with Cube3 Architects. Cube3 provided the requested information, including information on dimensions, volumes, spaces, layout, section views throughout the building, grades, etc. The majority of Holmes & Edwards comments have been addressed positively, with a couple of items outstanding. Mr. O'Connell stated that a recommendation will be provided to the City Council.

Chairman Geary asked if the Board had any questions. None.

7:18 PM: On behalf of the Planning Department, Ms. Kristina Johnson recommended that the Board offer an affirmative recommendation to the City Council subject to the Applicant's addressing any outstanding issues related to the completeness of the Special Permit Application outlined in the Planning Department's technical memorandum dated June 11, 2013, signed by Kristina Johnson.

Planning Director Harrington summarized, stating that the Departmental review and the City Council peer reviewers and their reports were brought to the Planning Board so the Board would have the basis to make a recommendation to the City Council. The Director stated that an adequate review has been done and thanked staff member Kristina Johnson and the peer review consultants. The Director also noted that the Applicant's attorney, Robert Fleming, was present. Attorney Fleming declined the opportunity to speak. There were no further questions or discussion from the Board.

7:22 PM

MOTION: by Member Barry that the Planning Board will provide an Affirmative Recommendation to the City Council regarding the Special Permit Application subject to the petitioner addressing any outstanding issues as outlined in the Planning Department's technical memorandum dated June 11, 2013.

SECOND: Member Fay

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES

Public Hearing, 157 Hancock Street, Special Permit - Site Plan Review
Planning Board Case No. 2013-06

Planning Director Harrington stated that Councillor Kevin Coughlin had arrived. Chairman Geary stated that the Public Hearing which was called at 7:05 PM and held in abeyance until the Councillor's arrival would begin.

Attorney William Keener presented on behalf of Murphy Twin Development LLC, 21 Adley Drive, Abington, Massachusetts 02351. Attorney Keener noted that David Murphy was present, and Peter Murphy's name is on the application but Peter could not attend tonight. Attorney Keener quickly reviewed the history of the site: formerly the site of the Ritz Motel, which was razed when the property was sold a few years ago. In 2008, a project permit Decision was issued by the Planning Board for 22 extended stay hotel units. The permit was extended due to the Permit Extension Act. Due to the bad economy, nothing was built, and the site was sold. Murphy Twin Development purchased the site recently.

Brian Donahue, Donahue Architects, Quincy, is the architect for the current project, and was the architect for the former permitted proposed project. Attorney Keener stated that Steve DesRoche, Neponset Valley Survey, is the engineer for the project. Attorney Keener stated that the building is essentially the same as the formerly permitted proposed structure but now designed with 14 residential units: 3 one-bedroom units, 11 two-bedroom units. Attorney Keener stated that the project is before the Board seeking parking relief. Proposed are 14 parking spaces available for 14 units. The building is one-quarter mile from the MBTA train station, he stated. Also, there is no loading dock; no commercial vehicles will be associated with the proposed residential building, Attorney Keener stated. The building sits on about 9,000 square feet of land; the site is about 9,900 square feet.

7:26 PM: Architect Brian Donahue, Principle of Donahue Architects, Quincy, presented using displays. He stated that he was before the Planning Board in 2008 for the permitted 22 extended-stay units. Mr. Donahue stated the proposed building is the same in terms of the footprint, height, architectural elements, elevations. Some fenestrations have been changed to fit with the residential use, and former spaces reserved for meeting rooms/office space have been redesigned. The proposed building has been repositioned away from the lot lines, though the site is tight, Mr. Donahue stated. No soil samples or borings have been performed yet, but will be done. Mr. Donahue said that they will work with their consultants and the City to ensure the best and safest construction, if the project is approved.

Chairman Geary asked about access/egress issues. Using displays, Mr. Donahue explained that the residential parking is entirely under the footprint of the building in a garage, 14 parking spaces. Vehicle entry/egress is off Hancock Street. Accessible entry to the building is on the upper part of Spruce Street, Mr. Donahue said. Mr. Donahue touched for a moment upon landscaping. In response to a question from Chairman Geary, Mr. Donahue confirmed that all intended residential parking is in the garage. Mr. Donahue stated that there is no intended surface parking. Member Barry verified that the entrance to the garage will be wide enough for two-way car entry/exit.

Mr. Robert Stevens, Quincy Urban Renewal Planner, introduced James White, PE, of HW Moore Associates, Boston, peer reviewer on behalf of the Board. Mr. White stated that their initial review report was submitted on 6/14/13, and a newly revised report was submitted today, 6/19/13, with the Applicant's plans updated after receiving the architect's response. Mr. White spoke with the project engineer today, he stated, and the engineer doesn't see any issues that cannot be addressed. The engineer is currently revising the plans. Mr. White reviewed some of the major outstanding points of the peer review reports (6/14/13 & 6/19/13), including: vehicle access is on Hancock Street due to the topography on Spruce Street; there is no drain on Hancock Street—their drainage cannot be connected to a catch basin; a new manhole is needed; the plan is not sufficiently engineered at this time—show fire line, water line, etc.; Mr. White stated he had not seen the Landscape plan until this meeting; there are still about 7 or 8 items that need to be addressed, Mr. White stated.

The Chairman asked if the Board had any further comments or questions at this time. None.

7:35 PM: Robert Stevens reviewed and explained points of his Departmental project review recommendation memorandum provided to the Board (dated 6/19/13), which also lists proposed Conditions of approval. Mr. Stevens noted that the Applicant was granted waivers, as requested, and did not need to submit a traffic study or an engineering feasibility study. Mr. Stevens stated that the Applicant did respond to many outstanding items listed in the peer review reports, but a few outstanding items remain. Mr. Stevens stated that recommended Conditions will allow the Applicant to submit final revised plans, and City Departmental comments are also incorporated in the proposed

Conditions. The Departmental recommendation is that the Board approve this proposal with Conditions, Mr. Stevens stated.

In response to Chairman Geary's question, Mr. Stevens confirmed that the shell of the building including the garage access/egress to/from Hancock Street was the same as approved by the Board back in 2008, though the location of the building was slightly shifted as the Applicant had stated. Also, Mr. Stevens confirmed to the Chairman that the access/egress location was the subject of the traffic study done at that time.

Mr. Stevens stated that the Applicant is asking for a reduced number of parking spaces: 1 parking space per dwelling unit; the Zoning requirement is 1.5 spaces per dwelling unit. He stated that the Applicant's main reasoning is that the location is within one-quarter mile of the North Quincy train station. Mr. Stevens said that the City of Quincy has granted that parking ratio for residential developments that close to a train station in the past.

Chairman William Geary addressed the public and explained that attendees have the opportunity to speak or sign in favor or against a project, or express concerns, or ask questions. Elected officials also have the opportunity, the Chairman instructed, to speak on behalf of their constituents.

7:43 PM: Ward 3 City Councillor Kevin Coughlin, who resides at 19 Small Street, near the Montclair area, Quincy, stated that he has been a City Councillor for about 12 years. Councillor Coughlin stated that this site and the former Ritz Motel were a blight to the area. When the property was sold to the last owner, the Ritz Motel was razed. Unfortunately, the previous owner could not develop the vacant site due to the bad economy. Councillor Coughlin stated that he vetted the formerly proposed project with the neighborhood at that time, and they expressed support back then and felt the architecture fit in with the neighborhood. The vacant lot is also a blight, he said.

The Councillor expressed concerns:

- The pull-up spaces on Spruce Street should be eliminated, as he is not in favor of people pulling up onto the sidewalk.
- The recently repaved street area should not be impacted by utility work. The repaved areas should look as nice as they do now after construction is complete.
- The construction hours for Monday through Friday shall be from 7 am – 5 pm. (Not 7 am-7 pm.)
- There should be some kind of buffering area for abutters.

Councillor Coughlin stated that he would be in support of the proposal if those concerns were addressed. The Councillor also stated that he sent letters out to neighbors and spoke directly with some of them, and none expressed apprehension about this project moving forward.

7:43 PM: Mr. William Chiu, 15 Spruce Street, Quincy, spoke strongly in opposition to the project as it is proposed. He stressed that the building should be much smaller, less units. He has lived on Spruce Street for 26 years, he said. He stated that 14 cars will not be able to fit in the 14 parking spaces proposed. Attorney William Keener stated that the spaces will comply with requirements and vehicles will fit. Mr. Chiu asked if there will be a resident manager. Attorney Keener stated that there would not be a resident manager. Mr. Chiu spoke of the current traffic problems and noise problems. Mr. Chiu asked for the building to be reduced to 10 units or 12 units at most. Mr. Chiu stated that he is afraid that new developments will model this development if it is approved—too many units on too small a site.

Speaking in favor of the project, Mr. Jim Sullivan, business owner since 1986 at 151 Hancock Street, stated that this area is a gateway into Quincy. Mr. Sullivan said he fully supports logical development in the area, and sees this project as an opportunity to change a blighted location into the beginning of an improved gateway entrance into the City of Quincy.

Chairman Geary asked if anyone else would like to speak or sign in favor or in opposition to the proposal. None.

7:50 PM

MOTION: by Member Adams to close the Public Hearing

SECOND: Member Barry

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES

Mr. Robert Stevens stated that the Department's recommendation is to approve with Conditions. Mr. Stevens carefully reviewed the points listed in his 6/19/13 memorandum to the Board, including recommended Planning Board Actions and Recommended Conditions.

Attorney William Keener commented that he has been in close contact with Robert Stevens over the past weeks. Attorney Keener confirmed that the pull-up spaces on Spruce Street will be eliminated, and agrees to the reduced Monday through Friday construction hours of 7 am to 5 pm.

7:56 PM

MOTION: by Member Adams that the Planning Board finds that there will be no substantial detriment as a result of the reduced number of off-street parking spaces

SECOND: Member Barry

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES

7:57 PM

MOTION: by Member Adams that the Planning Board approves Site Plan Review under section 17.9.5.1(1) and Special Permit under 17.9.4 and 17.5.1.17 related to parking requirements for Case No. 2013-06 contingent on the submission of revised plans noted in the recommended Conditions:

1. The Site Plans prepared for the Applicant by Donahue Architects, Inc. dated May 29, 2013 and revised June 18, 2013 shall be revised to eliminate the proposed two parking space pull-off on Spruce Street and addressed the issues raised in the Peer Review Report dated June 14, 2013 and follow-up Peer Review memorandum dated June 19, 2013.
2. Proposed Grading & Drainage Plan prepared for the Applicant by Sean A. Barry, PE dated February 2, 2013 will be revised to address the issues raised in Engineering Department comment letter and the Peer Review Report dated June 14, 2013 and follow-up Peer Review memorandum dated June 19, 2013.
3. Prior to the issuance of a building permit, the Applicant must satisfy the City's Affordable Housing Ordinance through a binding affordable housing condition issued by the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Committee (one (1) affordable 2 bedroom first floor handicapped accessible dwelling unit is required by this decision).
4. Prior to the commencement of any work on the site, the Applicant shall submit to the Planning Board a written detailed Construction Methods and Sequence of Construction plan approved by the Building

Commissioner. The Applicant shall also include the name(s) and telephone number(s) of the person(s) responsible on the site.

5. Comment letters from the Health Department, Inspectional Services Department, and Engineering Department are to be adhered to.
6. Minor changes may be allowed to the Final Development Plans subject to the approval of the Planning Director. The Planning Board must approve any changes or plan revisions that are considered substantial.
7. The terms and provisions of this Site Plan Review-Special Permit shall inure to the benefit of, and be binding upon, all successor owners of the Project Site.
8. The hours for construction activities and delivery of materials will be as follows:
7:00 am to 5:00 pm Monday thru Friday
8:00 am to 4:00 pm Saturday
All construction and deliveries shall be prohibited on Sunday unless same are approved by the Building Commissioner.

SECOND: Member Barry

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES

BUSINESS MEETING: (continued from prior to Public Hearing, above)

Agenda Item #2: Deliberation and Vote with respect to Planning Board recommendation re: Proposed Quincy Zoning Ordinance Amendment, Section 6.9 Registered Marijuana Dispensaries and Section 10 to include definition of Registered Marijuana Dispensaries, Planning Board review of City Council Order No. 2013-061.

Planning Director Harrington stated that interim regulations exist from the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, Department of Health. Quincy has a nine-month moratorium in place with the majority of months remaining. The Director recommended that the Board carry this item over to its next meeting.

8:00 PM

MOTION: by Member Barry to carry this Agenda Item #2 over to the next Planning Board meeting

SECOND: Member Fay

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES

Agenda Item #3: Council Orders: No. 2013-095 and No. 2013-096, forwarded to the Board by Councillor Palmucci for review of a proposed zoning amendment related to SPGA authority in PUD zoning district.

Planning Director Harrington stated that this information was forwarded to him as a Communication, and Councillor Palmucci requested that the information be distributed to the Planning Board. The Director stated that the City Council voted to not request a Planning Board opinion at this time, until the Council had reviewed the information further.

Chairman Geary stated that no action is required by the Planning Board at this time. This matter tabled until the call of the Chairman.

Agenda Item #4:

Ethics Training: Mandatory training required under the Massachusetts Conflict of Interest Law.

The Chairman stated that some of the Board Members have filed their ethics training test certificates, and others will complete the task shortly.

8:03 PM

MOTION: by Member Fay to adjourn

SECOND: Member Barry

VOTE: 4-0 MOTION CARRIES